

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 218420

16

ORIGIN EUR-02

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 PM-01 ACDA-01 /005 R

DRAFTED BY:EUR/RPM:VLEHOVICH:MEM
APPROVED BY:EUR/RPM:LTC RGTHOMPSON
DISTRIBUTION: EUR PM ACDA

----- 041111

R 060157Z NOV 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY ANKARA
AMEMBASSY ATHENS
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
AMEMBASSY BUCHAREST
AMEMBASSY BUDAPEST
AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN
USMISSION GENEVA
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
AMEMBASSY LISBON
AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
AMEMBASSY OSLO
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY PRAGUE
AMEMBASSY REYKJAVIK
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY SOFIA
AMEMBASSY WARSAW

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 218420

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

FOLLOWING SENT ACTION SECSTATE SECDEF WASHDC INFO USNATO BONN
LONDON USNMR SHAPE USCINCEUR NOV 1 FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA REPEATED
TO YOU. QUOTE:

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 218420

EO: 11652: N/A

TAGS: PARM NATO

SUBJ: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AMBASSADOR QUARLES PRESS CONFERENCE
OCTOBER 31

SUMMARY: QUARLES MET AT AUSTRIAN PRESS CENTER WITH OVER 175 REPORTERS, TV AND RADIO CORRESPONDENTS. HIS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND STATEMENT ARE SUBJECT OF SEPTTEL. FOLLOWING WERE THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS AFTER INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. (SEPTELS) END SUMMARY.

1. QUESTION: YOU SPELLED OUT DIFFERENCES IN EAST-WEST OPINION. THE EASTERN SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS AS CONTAINED IN THEIR OPENING SPEECHES DIFFER FROM THE WEST. WHY DID YOU STATE THAT WE MADE A "GOOD START". ANSWER: IT WOULD BE SURPRISING IF OUR PRINCIPLES WERE IN COMPLETE AGREEMENT, FOR IN THAT CASE THERE WOULD BE NO NEED TO HOLD A CONFERENCE. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE VIEWPOINTS WERE PRESENTED WAS CONSTRUCTIVE.

2. QUESTION: DID ANY OF THE EASTERN STATEMENTS SHOW A WILLINGNESS TO REDUCE CONVENTIONAL SUPERIORITY ON THE EASTERN SIDE? ANSWER: MOST OF THE EASTERN STATEMENTS GENERALLY REFERRED TO BREZHNEV'S SPEECH IN MOSCOW WHICH PRESUPPOSES A BALANCE. I SUPPOSE THAT THE DISPARITY CONCEPT WHICH IS IMPORTANT TO US WILL BE A MAJOR SUBJECT IN FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS.

3. QUESTION: THE NATO STATEMENTS PUT THE FOCUS ON SOVIET AND US FORCES. DID THE EASTERN STATEMENTS SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THAT? ANSWER: THE WARSAW PACT VIEW SUGGESTED WE SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON "NATIONAL AND FOREIGN TROOPS." THESE ARE DIFFERING CONCEPTS.

4. QUESTION: WAS THE RUSSIAN SPEECH AS LONG AS THE AMERICAN ONE, AND DID IT DEVIATE FROM OTHER WARSAW PACT SPEECHES? ANSWER: IT WAS CONSIDERABLE SHORTER THAN THE US SPEECH AND IT QUOTED EXTENSIVELY FROM BREZHNEV.

5. QUESTION: CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT THE COMMON CEILING AND THE CONCEPT OF EQUAL NUMBERS IN REDUCTIONS? ANSWER: WHAT WE ARE STRIVING FOR IS APPROXIMATE PARITY OF GROUND PERSONNEL IN THE REDUCTION AREA, A COMMON CEILING. COMMENT: THIS IS AN AWKWARD FORMULATION AND SHOULD NOT BE USED FURTHER.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 218420

6. QUESTION: THE EAST SAID NOTHING ABOUT HUNGARY IN ITS OPENING SPEECHES. LAST MAY THE HUNGARIAN AMBASSADOR STATED THAT HUNGARY WOULD BECOME A FULL PARTICIPANT ONLY IF ITALY WOULD ALSO BE ONE. THE SOVIET PRESS SAID THE HUNGARIANS WILL NOT BE FULL PARTICIPANTS. WHY ARE YOU OPTIMISTIC ON THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION? ANSWER: IN THE COURSE OF THE PREPARATORY TALKS, IT WAS SAID THAT IF WE DECIDED TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION THERE WOULD BE NO PROCEDURAL OBJECTION FROM THE OTHER SIDE. WE WOULD THEREFORE EXPECT A DISCUSSION ON THIS SUBJECT. THERE IS NO SIMILAR AGREEMENT WITH REGARD TO ITALY. WE CANNOT NOW ANTICIPATE FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING A DISCUSSION ON HUNGARY.

7. QUESTION: THE WESTERN FOCUS SEEMS ON GROUND TROOPS ONLY. IS THE AIR FORCE INCLUDED? ANSWER: WE DO NOT INTEND TO INCLUDE THE AIR FORCE. PLANES CAN BE WITHDRAWN AND RETURNED EXTREMELY QUICKLY. THEIR FUNCTIONS ARE DIFFICULT TO ASCERTAIN. WE CONCENTRATE ON THE HARD CORE OF THE MILITARY PROBLEM WHICH IS CAUSING TENSION, NAMELY THAT OF GROUND FORCES.

8. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF US GROUND FORCES AND AIR FORCES IN EUROPE, ANSWER: I DON'T KNOW.

9. QUESTION: DOES THE EASTERN SIDE SHARE THE ALLIED VIEW ON NOT INCLUDING AIR FORCES? ANSWER: BREZHNEV'S SPEECH QUOTES HIM AS MENTIONING AIR FORCES; THEREFORE WE PRESUME THIS WILL BE ONE OF THEIR POINTS IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

10. QUESTION: AS TO ATOMIC FORCES, WHAT ABOUT BREZHNEV'S PROPOSAL? ANSWER: AT THIS STAGE AT LEAST WE DO NOT EXPECT TO INCLUDE NUCLEAR ARMS. COMMENT: AN AWKWARD FORMULATION, NOT FOR FURTHER USE.

11. QUESTION: CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT THE PROCEDURE OF FUTURE MEETINGS. ANSWER: IT HAS BEEN AGREED TENTATIVELY THAT THERE WILL BE TWO PLENARY MEETINGS A WEEK. THE RHYTHM COULD SLOW DOWN LATER ON. IN THE COURSE OF THESE MEETINGS WE INTEND TO UNFOLD THE THEMES CONTAINED IN THE WESTERN STATEMENTS IN DETAIL. WE EXPECT THE OTHER SIDE WILL DO THE SAME CONCERNING THEIR THEMES.

12. QUESTION: WHEN WILL THESE MEETINGS BE? ANSWER: TUESDAYS AND THURSDAYS.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 218420

13. QUESTION: CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT THE EFFECT OF THE CURRENT REASSESSMENT OF US MILITARY FORCES IN GERMANY ON THE DISCUSSIONS? ANSWER: THIS HAS NO RELEVANCE TO THE MBFR TALKS.

14. QUESTION: DO COLLATERAL MEASURES INCLUDE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF TROOP MOVEMENTS? ANSWER: YES. THERE ARE ALSO THE QUESTIONS OF OBSERVERS AND LIMITATION ON LARGE TROOP UNIT MOVEMENTS IN THE REDUCTION AREA. THE PURPOSE IS TO GIVE EACH SIDE ADVANCE WARNING TO REMOVE THE RISK OF MISCALCULATION AND THE FEAR OF SURPRISE ATTACK AND THUS BRING ABOUT A CHANGE IN PERCEPTION.

15. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE GENERAL POLICY OF THE WESTERN DELEGATION ON PRESS BRIEFINGS. ANSWER: WE MUST MAINTAIN A CERTAIN DEGREE OF CONFIDENTIALITY ON THE DETAILS OF THE PROPOSALS ADVANCED TO THE OTHER SIDE. HOWEVER, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE PRESS BE KEPT INFORMED ON THE MAIN LINES OF THE PROCEDURES. WE WILL SEE TO IT THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE DONE, BUT THE EXACT FORM HAS NOT BEEN DETERMINED.

16. QUESTION: IN REFERENCE TO POINT I (SEE SEPTTEL ON QUARLES

STATEMENT), WHAT IS MEANT WHEN YOU SPEAK ABOUT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY? ANSWER: THIS IS MERELY A WARNING AND THERE IS NOT PRECISE CONTEXT TO THAT. WE ARE NOT SET ON BUILDING A EUROPEAN UNION. WE DON'T YET KNOW MANY OF ITS CONTENTS, PARTICULARLY THE MILITARY ONE WHERE THERE WILL HAVE TO BE FLEXIBILITY WITHIN CEILINGS. WHATEVER MEASURE IS PROPOSED IN THE MEETINGS, WE WILL KEEP IN MIND ITS CONSEQUENCE FOR A EUROPEAN UNION.

17. QUESTION: SOME EAST EUROPEAN SPEAKERS INVITED OTHER INTERESTED COUNTRIES TO THE MBFR MEETING. ANSWER: WE ARE QUITE AWARE OF THIS INTEREST EVER SINCE THE TALKS STARTED. THERE IS A WILLINGNESS TO KEEP OTHERS INFORMED AND WE WILL DO SO. IT IS OUR OPINION THAT THESE NEGOTIATIONS ARE BETWEEN TWO ALLIANCES AND RELATED TO THE SPECIFIC AREA OF CENTRAL EUROPE. IT WOULD NOT BE USEFUL, THEREFORE, TO ADMIT OTHER COUNTRIES. THE JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE AGREED ON THE GENERAL OBJECTIVES AS BEING STRENGTHENING PEACE AND SECURITY IN EUROPE--THAT IS ALL OF EUROPE. THE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD HAVE NO DESTABILIZING EFFECTS ON THE FLANKS AND ON OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. BREZHNEV MADE SIMILAR MENTION THAT THE EXISTING BALANCE IN EUROPE AS A WHOLE AND MBFR SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 218420

ADVERSELY AFFECTED. WE ARE PREPARED TO KEEP OTHERS FULLY INFORMED.

18. QUESTION: YOU MENTIONED PLENARIES TWICE A WEEK. HOW ABOUT WORKING GROUPS? ROMANIA HAS INDICATED THAT IT WANTS TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL BODIES DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS. ANSWER: THE JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE RECORDED THAT DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS THERE WILL BE DISCUSSIONS LEADING TO THE SETTING UP OF WORKING BODIES. THERE WERE NO SPECIFIC PROPOSALS MADE. IN OUR VIEW THESE WORKING BODIES WOULD HAVE TO BE OPEN-ENDED.

19. QUESTION: WHAT WILL BE THE FIRST SUBJECTS AT THE PLENARY? ANSWER: WE INTEND TO GIVE MORE DETAIL TO WHAT WE MEAN BY THE DIFFERENT CONCEPTS CONTAINED IN THE OPENING STATEMENTS. WE EXPECT NO EARLY INTENSIVE DIALOGUES BUT RATHER A FLOW WHICH WILL LEAD TO DIALOGUE AND WILL BE PREPARING THE GROUND FOR CONCRETE PROPOSALS WHICH I CANNOT REVEAL NOW.

20. QUESTION: IS THERE A GUARANTEE THAT AS LONG AS THE MBFR CONFERENCE GOES ON THERE WILL BE NO CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE STATES INVOLVED? ANSWER: THE WORD "GUARANTEE" GOES QUITE FAR. WE ARE HERE FOR IMPORTANT NEGOTIATIONS AND SERIOUS DISCUSSION. THIS WILL HAVE SOME BENEFICIAL INFLUENCE ON OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MAJOR POWERS, AND THEY WILL THEREFORE MAKE A MAXIMUM EFFORT AT RESTRAINT.

21. QUESTION: ARE THE TEXTS OF THE STATEMENTS MADE IN THE PLENARIES TO BE PUBLISHED? ANSWER: CONFERENCE PAPERS ONCE PUT TO THE OTHER SIDE ARE CONFIDENTIAL. IN OUR BRIEFINGS WE WILL TRY

TO OUTLINE THE GENERAL IDEAS.

22. QUESTION: HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO DISCUSS MUTUAL REDUCTIONS IF ONE PARTNER WANTS TO REDUCE UNILATERALLY? ANSWER: I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY PLANNED CHANGE IN US FORCE LEVELS IN EUROPE.

23. QUESTION: I AM REFERRING TO THE SCHLESINGER STATEMENT. ANSWER: THE PENTAGON REVIEWS THE QUESTION OF US FORCES ALL THE TIME. THE REDUCTION MEASURES WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE ARE CONCENTRATED ON MBFR.

24. QUESTION: DOES THE NEAR EAST CRISIS HAVE ANY EFFECT ON THE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 218420

TALKS? ANSWER: I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY.

25. QUESTION: DID THE OTHER SIDE CONCEDE THAT DISPARITIES EXIST? ANSWER: THEY PRESUPPOSE THAT THERE IS AN EXISTING BALANCE OF FORCES.

26. QUESTION: WHAT ABOUT FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN THE TALKS? ANSWER: THIS IS FOR FRANCE TO DECIDE. THUS FAR THERE IS NO PARTICIPATION. NO ONE ELSE CAN FORCE FRANCE TO PARTICIPATE, BUT IT HAS THE RIGHT TO DO SO. IF FRANCE SO DECIDES, IT WOULD PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE TALKS. IT IS ALSO BEING INFORMED ABOUT THEM VIA NATO.

27. QUESTION: THE EAST SAYS THERE IS A BALANCE OF FORCES AND NATO MAINTAINS THAT DISPARITIES EXIST. ANSWER: THERE IS DEFINITELY A DISPARITY IN FORCE NUMBERS. I HAVE NO AUTHENTIC FIGURES, BUT IF YOU USE IISS SOURCES YOU WILL FIND THAT THERE ARE 770,000 NATO FORCES, A FIGURE WHICH IS FAIRLY CORRECT. AS TO THE WARSAW PACT, IN THE REDUCTION AREA THERE ARE WELL OVER 900,000 MEN. THUS THERE IS A DEFINITE DISPARITY IN NUMBERS.

28. QUESTION: WILL FRENCH FORCES BE COUNTED IN THE REDUCTION? ANSWER: FRENCH FORCES IN GERMANY ARE COUNTED IN, BUT SINCE FRANCE IS NOT A PARTICIPANT THERE CAN BE NO REQUEST FOR REDUCTION. OTHERS WILL HAVE TO CARRY A BIGGER BURDEN.

29. QUESTION: IS IT THE FIRST AIRM OF THE ALLIES TO GO FOR PARITY AND THEN REDUCTION? ANSWER: WE HAVE IN MIND IN THE FIRST PHASE US-SOVIET FORCE REDUCTIONS. IN A FURTHER PHASE THERE SHOULD BE APPROXIMATELY ROUGH PARITY AT LOWER LEVELS THROUGH REDUCTIONS.

30. QUESTION: WHICH OTHER WEAPONS DOES THE WEST WANT TO EXCLUDE FROM THE NEGOTIATIONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCES AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS? ANSWER: WE WANT TO FOCUS ON GROUND ARMIES AND THEIR EQUIPMENT. I CANNOT NOW ENTER ON FULL DETAILS ON FUTURE NEGOTIATING POSITIONS.

31. QUESTION: WOULD THE MILITARY EXPERIENCE OF THE NEAR EAST
WAR HAVE ANY INFLUENCE ON MBFR? ANSWER: NO. THE ATMOSPHERE IS
EXCELLENT. THERE IS NO REFLECTION THERE. END OF PRESS CONFERENCE.

HUMES UNQTE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 218420

RUSH

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: cunninfx
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE218420
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter:
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731167/abqcejoh.tel
Line Count: 283
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: cunninfx
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29-Aug-2001 by rowellE0>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by cunninfx>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AMBASSADOR QUARLES PRESS CONFERENCE OCTOBER 31
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: ANKARA
ATHENS
BRUSSELS
BUCHAREST
BUDAPEST
COPENHAGEN
GENEVA

THE HAGUE
LISBON
LUXEMBOURG
MOSCOW
OSLO
OTTAWA
PRAGUE
REYKJAVIK
ROME
SOFIA
WARSAW

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005